since we find even in the Julian period a record of the sumptuous palaces that were raised by the illustrious citizens of Rome, vying with each other in the display of all that wealth could procure or art produce. The union of architecture, painting, and sculpture could never have been surpassed, as seen in some of the palaces, as we should call them, or villas, as they were termed by the Romans, when we find that even the house of Sallust, who could hardly have possessed much wealth, was adorned with such figures as the Dying Gladiator, the Silenus, and Infant Hercules, as discovered in the ruins; and the astonishingly beautiful fresco paintings on the walls of the exhumed city of Pompeii, a fourth or fifth-rate town, lead us to conclude that not less valuable works of art ornamented the residences of a Mecænas, a Lucullus, or a Hadrian in the capital of the world; and we know that Hadrian possessed those matchless triumphs of the sculptor's power, the Venus de Medici, the Faun, the Flora, as found in the ruins of his villa, and of course the Antinous.

These sculptures and paintings, however, were the productions of Greek artists, and there can be no doubt that much of the best architecture of Rome was also the offspring of Greek taste. Sylla is said to have first introduced Greek architects in Rome; in the time of Pompey and Cæsar the Grecian artists Arcesilaus, Pasiteles, Zopyrus, and Criton resided in Rome. The architect who planned the temple of Jupiter Stator, was Hermodorus of Salamis; many temples were designed by two natives of Laconia, Saurus and Batrachus, who have perpetuated their fame by the lizard and frog, the symbols of their names, still to be seen sculptured on the columns in some of the churches* of Rome, which once belonged to Pagan temples, whilst the two architects, Chrysippus and Cluatius, employed by Cicero, were also Greeks.

Certain it is that after Greece became a Roman province in the year 145 B. C., we begin to find architecture employed by the conquerors of the world to record their triumphs in the temples to which they consecrated their spoils, in the theatres in which the wild beasts, or men as wild, of far distant climes, were exhibited to the admiring multitudes, in the arches under which the proud victors entered the city.

> "With acclamation, and the martial clang
> Of instruments, and cars laden with spoil,"

or in the private dwellings which yet contained within their walls treasures which kings might envy, yet hardly purchase, those beautiful creations of the sculptor's chisel and the painter's pencil, of which, though the latter are lost to us, many of the first still survive the admiration, almost the homage of pilgrims to the shrines of art in the eternal city; when to the actual possession of the matchless works of art with which Rome abounds, we add the charm which the memory of her great men imparts to the localities, where

> "The very dust we tread stirs us with life,
> And not a breath, but from the ground sends up
> Something of human grandeur."

When we recall the mighty names of Pompey, Cæsar, Brutus, Cato, the Scipios, the Decii, and the softer shades of Virgil, Horace, and Ovid, we cannot wonder at the profound interest which has always been attached to her who was once the mistress of the world, but is now the Niobe of nations.

In addition to the magnificent buildings erected in the time of the Cæsars,—

> "When Rome in noon-tide empire grasp'd the world,"

modern Rome attracts the observation of the visitor by the scarcely less splendid structures which arose under the auspices of the popes, who, calling themselves the servants of servants, in the pride of humility, assumed a power scarcely inferior to that of the former imperial masters of Rome. But whilst we condemn their presumption in arrogating to themselves universal dominion, we must do them the justice to admit that they patronized the fine arts, encouraged learning, and promoted taste. The religious structures erected under their auspices were adorned with the performances of men "whose pencil had a voice," and which have made the names of Michael Angelo, Raffaelle, and Correggio, immortal.

The chief, if not almost the only public buildings on which the Greeks delighted to bestow the graces of architecture were temples, as if to none but the divinities were its glories appropriate. But the Romans applied architecture in all its pomp to a great variety of purposes unknown to the Greeks, and not only to magnificent temples for worship, and to stately porticoes for recreation, but to colossal theatres and hippodromes for amusement, aqueducts of wondrous length, triumphal arches, lofty columns of commemoration, and palaces rivalling towns in extent, and public baths of astonishing splendour and size, and halls of justice.

The Romans adopted chiefly in their public buildings, the latest and richest of the Greek orders, the Corinthian, on which they grafted another order, the Composite, which has only the distinction of being encumbered with a profusion of ornament conceived in a taste far removed from the purity of the Greeks. The Doric order, which was brought to such a height of perfection in Greece, was evidently no favourite with the Romans, to whom its severe requirements were a restraint in the way of indulging in a fondness for gorgeous embellishment.

With the exception of the Trajan and Antonine pillars, I am not aware that Rome possessed any specimens of the Doric order in the manner of the Greeks, and even these can hardly be considered as specimens of attic taste and simplicity, since they have moulded bases, and the capitals have the Ionic ovolo cut in the echinus, whilst the lowest stages in which the Coliseum and theatre of Marcellus are divided, are adorned with columns after the fashion of the so-called improved Roman Doric style.

The examples of Ionic also are not numerous in Rome, nor are these in the best taste:—the temples dedicated to Manly Fortune and to Concord are proofs of this assertion, and, in fact, only deserve to be mentioned, that imitation should be avoided.

But if we cannot award any praise to the Romans in their employment of two out of the three ancient orders, we must admit their claim to admiration for the manner in which they introduced the third. This, the latest order among the Greeks, was only making a place for itself in Athens at the time of the Roman conquest, and our specimens of the style are limited to very few examples, and those of very small buildings; and it is rather remarkable that Corinth, whence the name of this order is derived, should not only have no specimen remaining, nor is it known ever to have possessed one, but exhibits in its temple perhaps the oldest example of the Doric order in Attica.

The temples built at Rome of the Corinthian order were the stateliest examples ever raised; those dedicated to Jupiter Stator, to Jupiter Tonans, and to Mars Ultor, of which only fragments remain, must have been truly magnificent buildings with columns nearly 50 feet high, and 5 feet in diameter, and evidently they were designed by Greek taste before the lines of the entablature were broken, or other derelictions from purity were introduced.

The great distinction between the pure Greek styles, and the later or debased Roman orders, was caused by the introduction of a feature which has had a wonderful and salutary influence upon architecture. The origin of the arch, like other vexed questions, may serve to amuse and bewilder the learned, who seem to find glimpses, rare indeed, and almost isolated, of its existence among the monuments of Egypt, of India, of Assyria, and of early Greece. But these few instances only prove that the arch, if known, was not used in general among these nations. But the Romans, although not strictly entitled to the parentage of the arch, have, by their adoption of that feature, earned for themselves as much honour as if they were discoverers; and to them alone is clearly due the merit of first appreciating and employing its wonderful properties. And if in some instances we must regret to see its application, as in cases where the continuous architrave is dispensed with to make way for arches springing at once from column to column, yet in others we cannot but applaud the daring ingenuity with which wide spaces are vaulted, as in the Temples of Peace and Minerva Medica. We must admire the invention which enables us to cross mighty rivers,—to hang the lofty dome in air,—and above all, instead of being obliged, as in former times, to employ ponderous blocks for imposts and architraves, from the difficulty of otherwise spanning large spaces, we must confess our obligations to a feature which can be formed into the most magnificent proportions by small and convenient materials, accessible in all climates and in all situations; and more than all, it may be safely asserted that, to the employment of the arch by the Romans, afterwards by the Byzantines, and again returning to its first country, by the Italians, we are indebted for the introduction of a system of architecture which has enchanted the world for several centuries with its beautiful conceptions, and which has enriched Europe in particular with so many splendid cathedrals and churches, and which now, by common consent, is looked upon as most suited to edifices of a religious character.

In the limited space to which, of necessity, a paper of this nature must be confined, only a few of the important works of the Romans can be noticed, for the bare enumeration of them would fill a volume. The most striking monuments of their taste are temples, theatres, aqueducts, triumphal arches, and commemorative columns.

Very few, if any, remains can be found in Rome of buildings before the time of Julius Cæsar, who, as well as his great compeer, Pompey, built many temples. The latter built the Temple of Minerva out of the spoils of the Mithridatic war (B.C. 60), and a temple in honour of Venus close to the theatre, which he also erected. Cæsar built temples in honour of Venus and Clemency; and it is a curious trait to observe these stern warriors dedicating temples to the benignant divinities. Cæsar besides projected many magnificent and useful works which he might have carried out, had not his great career been stopped by a violent death, when

> "The foremost man of all the earth"

fell under the daggers of the conspirators.

But it was to his successor, the fortunate Augustus, that Rome owes the commencement of its architectural greatness; his was not an empty boast, that he found it built of brick, but would leave it of marble. Three such illustrious patrons of the arts have rarely been found at the same time as Augustus and his celebrated friends Mecænas and Agrippa. As Gibbon well observes, "The example of the sovereign was imitated by his ministers and generals, and his friend Agrippa left behind him the immortal monument of the Pantheon."

Augustus built a temple in honour of Apollo of white marble, in which the Sybilline books were kept; another magnificent temple in honour of Mars the Avenger, in which he directed that the Senate should always hold their consultations on the affairs of war. He reared another temple to Jupiter the Thunderer; a superb memorial of his gratitude for his escape from the lightning which killed his armour-bearer at the side of his litter. With the exception of the temple of Jupiter Stator, the two temples just mentioned were the most stately and magnificent in Rome; they are of the Corinthian order: that dedicated to Mars as the Avenger on the occasion of Augustus going forth to avenge the death of Julius Cæsar, consisted of a noble portico of eight columns in front, and eight on each flank, and occupying an area of 116 feet by 73 feet. These columns were 6 feet in diameter, and 58 feet high, the loftiest of their kind in Rome. Ovid in his Fasti (v. 549) alludes to this temple and its place in the Forum:

> "Ultor, ad ipse suos cœlo descendit honores
> Templaque in Augusto conspicienda foro."

The temple of Jupiter Tonans has only three fluted columns remaining to attest its former magnificence. They are of white marble, 46 feet high, in three blocks; the diameter is 4 feet 8 inches. It appears to have resembled the temple of Mars in its general plan, except that its portico consisted only of 6 columns. Those which remain were buried nearly up to their capitals when Camporesi reduced the hill and laid them open.

But the most splendid example of architec-

* The church of St. Eusebius, and of St. Lorenzo beyond the walls, have these interesting relics of the sculptor's genius.

To learn more about OCR and PDF Compression go to ThePaperlessOffice.org